

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/585,389	YAZAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David Lazaro	2155	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) David Lazaro. (3) Shrinath Malur (34,663).  
 (2) Patrice Winder. plw (4) Mr. Hara.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,6 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 5,812,626 by Teraslinna and US 6,470,016 by Kalkunte.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Arguments concerning the rejection based on the combination of Teraslinna and Kalkunte were presented and discussed. Particularly, points were discussed in terms of policy versus shaping in relation to Teraslianna and Kalkunte as well as points regarding the conversion of the packet including changes to a packet header. The examiner agrees that the arguments are sufficient in overcoming the rejection and should be formally submitted. The examiner further notes that an updated search would be required..